

**CITY OF BROKEN ARROW  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
MINUTES  
October 23, 2003**

The Planning Commission Agenda for this meeting was posted on October 17, 2003, at 10:00 a.m. on the City Hall Bulletin Board, 220 S. First Street.

1. The Broken Arrow Planning Commission met on Thursday, October 23, 2003, at 5:02 p.m.

2. Present: Robert Goranson, Chairman  
Renate Caldwell, Vice Chairperson  
Mike Lester, Commission Member  
Johnnie Parks, Commission Member  
Ricky Jones, Commission Member

Absent None

Staff Present: Farhad K. Daroga, City Planner  
Brent Murphy, Assistant City Planner  
Karl Fritschen, Staff Planner  
Joyce Snider, Admin Ass't  
April Parnell, Ass't City Attorney  
Jeff Westfall, Engineering Dept  
Allen Stanton, Chief Building Inspector

3. The Commission considered the minutes of the regular Planning Commission meeting held October 9, 2003. **Motion** by Mike Lester to approve the October 9, 2003, minutes as presented. The motion was seconded by Renate Caldwell.

Yes: Jones, Parks, Lester, Caldwell, Goranson

No: None

**Motion Approved**

4. The Commission considered the Consent Agenda. Farhad Daroga reviewed each item on the Consent Agenda.

**Motion** by Mike Lester to approve the Consent Agenda, as recommended by Staff, excluding Item No. 4G. The motion was seconded by Renate Caldwell.

April Parnell said she would prefer the motion to include the particulars of approvals and denials.

The motion was withdrawn by the maker, with the consent of the second.

**Motion** by Mike Lester to approve Item Nos. 4A, 4B, 4D, 4E, and 4F of the Consent Agenda, as recommended by Staff, denying Item No. 4C and removing Item No. 4G from the Consent Agenda.

The motion was seconded by Bob Goranson.

Yes: Jones, Parks, Lester, Caldwell, Goranson

No: None

**Motion approved.**

- 4A. PT03-123, DN03-179, Eagle Ridge Village preliminary plat, 42.07 acres, 1 lot, R-3, PUD 140, BAZ 1611, Elm Place, north of Albany (E. 61<sup>st</sup> Street South) Street, Breisch & Associates (Engineer). The applicant was present. This item was approved as recommended by Staff.
- 4B. PT03-124, DN03-180, Rooney Development at Cedar Ridge preliminary plat, 147.82 acres, 301 lots, R-1 and R-2, northeast of Florence (111<sup>th</sup>) Street and Mingo Road (97<sup>th</sup> East Avenue), Chapman, Cottle, Gill & Associates, Inc. (Engineer). The applicant was present. This item was approved as recommended by Staff.
- 4C. PT02-109, DN02-136, Bentley Village Amended conditional final plat, 22 acres, 80 lots, R-3 (BAZ 1448), south side of Jasper Street, one-third mile west of Aspen Avenue, Hall, Rosenbaum & Associates, Inc., (Engineer). The applicant was present. This item was denied as recommended by Staff.
- 4D. ST03-132, DN03-151, Citizens Security Bank landscape plan, 6.3 acres, C-2, BAZ 1061, southwest corner of Kenosha Street and Olive (129<sup>th</sup> East) Avenue, Bank Building Corporation (Applicant). The applicant was present. This item was approved as recommended by Staff.
- 4E. ST03-136, DN03-182, Wendy's at Tiger Plaza site and landscape plan, 0.91 acres, C-3, north of Kenosha Street on the east side of 23<sup>rd</sup> Street (County Line Road), DeShazo, Tang & Associates (Applicant). The applicant was not present. This item was approved as recommended by Staff.
- 4F. ST03-137, DN03-183, Alfred Glass and Metal site plan, 0.85 acres, I-1, Lot 7, Block 2, 61<sup>st</sup> Street Industrial Park, Buffington Co., Inc. (Applicant). The applicant was present. This item was approved as recommended by Staff.
- 4G. BAL 845, DN03-178, 5.65 acres, R-3, one-half mile south of Jasper (131<sup>st</sup>) Street, east side of Lynn Lane, Garye K and Patricia L. Myers (Applicant/Owners). The applicant was present. This item was removed from the Consent Agenda at the request of the applicant.

5. **ITEMS REMOVED FROM CONSENT AGENDA**

- 4G. The Commission considered BAL 845, DN03-178, 5.65 acres, R-3, one-half mile south of Jasper (131<sup>st</sup>) Street, east side of Lynn Lane, Garye K and Patricia L. Myers (Applicant/Owners). The Applicant, Garye Myers said the issues raised by City Staff have been dealt with and he had a revised survey with him and asked that this item be approved. Bob Goranson said, having just received this information, the Commission would like Staff to review it. Mr. Myer explained the location and amount of flood plain on his property and Bob Goranson looked at the survey. Farhad Daroga said there were several issues involved with this application that need to be resolved. Bob Goranson asked if anyone else had anything they wished to address in regard to this item. No one came forward.

**Motion** by Mike Lester to continue this matter to the next Planning Commission meeting. The motion was seconded by Johnnie Parks.

Yes: Jones, Parks, Lester, Caldwell, Goranson

No: None

**Motion approved.**

Staff informed Mr. Myers that this matter will be heard by the Planning Commission in their meeting of November 6, 2003.

6. The Commission considered PUD 133B, DN03-166, Cacy Mini-storage, 10.57 acres, IS, BAZ 1605, PT03-120, immediately north of the Creek Turnpike on the east side of 9<sup>th</sup> Street (Lynn Lane/177<sup>th</sup> East Avenue) Lewis Engineering (Applicant). Farhad Daroga presented the background, saying the front portion of the project will be mini-storage and the portion to the east will be residential. He said in the original PUD 133 the applicant had proposed that masonry be used on all four sides of the buildings. He said the only modification being requested is that masonry be required only on the south side of the buildings which fronts the Turnpike and the west side which fronts Lynn Lane. He said the north and east interior sides would be a non-masonry option the developer would have, the remainder of the PUD criteria and the plat would remain the same.

Bill Lewis, 5879 South Garnett Road, Tulsa, the project engineer, said the original concept included the use of masonry or drivet on all the exterior walls and this change has been requested as an economy. He said there are no windows or doors on the sides facing the Turnpike and Lynn Lane, except on the office building.

Bob Goranson asked if part of the property on the east side is in the flood plain. Brent Murphy clarified that masonry would be used only on the buildings that are adjacent to the highway and the Lynn Lane frontage, that all the other buildings would be metal. There were no protestants.

**Motion** by Mike Lester to recommend approval of PUD 133B as recommended by Staff. The motion was seconded by Bob Goranson.

Yes: Jones, Parks, Lester, Caldwell, Goranson

No: None

**Motion approved.**

7. The Commission considered BAZ 1616, 10.02 acres, A-1 to C-3, southwest corner of Elm Place and Florence (111<sup>th</sup>) Street, Vector Securities, Inc. (Applicant). Farhad Daroga presented the background, saying this site is undeveloped and the Comprehensive Plan shows Level 3 and Level 4 and part of it is in the flood plain area. He said Staff recommends approval, as presented in the report. Applicants were present and said they had nothing to add. There were no protestants.

**Motion** by Ricky Jones to recommend approval of BAZ 1616 as recommended by Staff. The motion was seconded by Johnnie Parks.

Yes: Jones, Parks, Lester, Caldwell, Goranson

No: None

**Motion approved.**

Brent Murphy said the applicant requested this item be heard by the City Council on November 3, 2003 and Staff indicated their approval.

8. The Commission took up a continued Public Hearing to consider an amendment to Article IX of the Broken Arrow Zoning Ordinance, Sign Regulations. Brent Murphy said that the Commission has been provided with the latest revision of the proposed sign ordinance with the minor changes directed by the Planning Commission, and clarified that the reference to wall signage was removed and portable sign regulations were revised and those items are identified in the text. Bob Goranson thanked Staff for the placement of the ordinance and related materials on the City's website where it could be found easily.

8. continued

Ricky Jones asked if the latest revision has been made available to the public and Brent Murphy said it has not, it became available this week.

Ron Whitaker, 3809 West Vandalia, Broken Arrow, showed pictures of signs and banners in various locations in Tulsa and Broken Arrow, saying large signs are not necessarily best, and signs do not make or break a business. He said allowances need to be made for big box businesses along the expressway because they bring in needed tax funds, and suggested looking at existing small businesses and the effect of signs on Broken Arrow residents. He provided a list of suggestions for sign regulations, including keeping signs 200 feet from residential areas, not allowing pole signs in the downtown area, eliminate flashing and strobe lights, signs should set back a minimum of five-feet from rights-of-way and be no higher than six-feet tall, with one-foot increase stair steps to 20-foot maximum, no more than 150 square feet display area, and other related items, including a periodic review of the sign ordinance by a business-citizens committee appointed by the City Council.

Bob Goranson asked about the distance of flashing lights from intersections and asked where the 200-foot distance in the present ordinance originated. Farhad Daroga said that came out of the review committee. Bob Goranson said he thought the distance stated was to avoid accidents due to motorists mistaking flashing lights for traffic lights. Johnnie Parks said that was a safety issue. Discussion followed regarding whether that subject was discussed by the 2003 Sign Committee. Ricky Jones said he didn't think the Committee looked specifically at that one item, but it was generally considered in the whole scope of things.

Tony Petrik, 717 West Southpark Blvd, Broken Arrow, said the mall at Stone Brier in Frisco, Texas is very large. He showed pictures of one side of it and pointed out that there are no signs, the signs around the outside of the mall is very limited and there are about 300 business in the mall. He said the signs allowed by Tulsa are those proposed for Broken Arrow and that bothered him. He said Mr. Sigler's statement that Frisco, Texas could get away with what they were doing (requiring small signs) because Plano is running out of room and people were moving to Frisco, which statement is true. He said the shift from Tulsa to Broken Arrow is partially because of the way Tulsa is making itself look. Mr. Petrik showed pictures of signs in Broken Arrow and pointed out their unobtrusive appearance. He talked about the history of cell tower problems, how the problems with visibility were solved and the contrast between the tower committee and the 2003 Sign Committee related to their makeup. He thanked the Planning Commission for their ongoing efforts to serve the community.

Bob Goranson asked if any response had been received from the community to the draft sign ordinance placed on the City website and Staff replied that there had been none to their knowledge.

Judy Arvay Wood, 600 West Waco Street, Broken Arrow, said, as a long-time resident of Broken Arrow, she had concerns. As a representative of a property management company which owns and management several locations, she said a lot of the tenants have expressed concern regarding signage and there needs to be a compromise. She said she has a sign which was seven feet tall with six-inch panels, two-feet wide which was inadequate, and across the street there is a 25-foot sign. She said tenants were wondering about the reason for the discrepancy. She said she had big name clients who have not located in Broken Arrow because of the sign requirements. Bob Goranson asked why people are not asking for PUDs or waivers by the City Council of the sign ordinance requirements, and talked about the positive response he has had from people in regard to the sign requirements. Discussion followed.

8. continued

Farhad Daroga said the existing Sign Code allows signs taller than seven-feet and if Ms. Arvay Wood wishes, she can contact his department in this regard.

Ralph Sigler, 11905 South Jupiter Court, Jenks, said he didn't have the latest sign ordinance revision.

Brent Murphy described the two changes made to the draft of the proposed ordinance.

Mr. Sigler outlined the mission of the Sign Committee and showed a number of photos of signs that would be allowed under the proposed sign ordinance. Discussion followed regarding sign heights and related property lines and setbacks, review by the Engineering Department of proposed signs in drainage easements, standards for ensuring the most objectivity possible. In regard to drainage easements, Farhad Daroga said the question here is the word public, which should be removed because if it is public property, a commercial shopping center owner wishing to put signs in a City easement must go through the City Council. He said if a shopping center has a drainage channel running through it, that is private property. The question is, is the City going to allow anyone to put signs on public property. If so, that needs to be clarified. Discussion followed.

Allen Stanton said he put that provision in the draft ordinance because the sign ordinance is part of the Zoning Code, which contains fencing requirements going through drainage easements. Whether these are privately or publicly owned is irrelevant, all need to be reviewed by the Engineering Department. He said the reasoning was that if there was a reasonable place that was considered to be a drainage easement, flood plain or other, it should be reviewed by the Engineering Department. Bob Goranson asked if this issue affects the City's storm water management policy regarding the prohibition of structures in the floodplain. Discussion followed and Allen Stanton said this provision originated with Staff rather than the Sign Committee. Further discussion followed and Brent Murphy pointed out that signs in drainage easements apply only to the office, commercial and industrial zoning districts which happen to have a drainage easement and approval would be required from the City Engineer.

Farhad Daroga said clarification may be needed that states that freestanding signs may be placed in public drainage easements as permitted by this ordinance with the approval of the City Engineer, and take the word "public" out. Allen Stanton said the entire statement could be removed because it was brought into this ordinance as a result of Staff debate. Bob Goranson pointed out that if the statement is removed it would allow signs to be placed in drainage easements without any approval. Allen Stanton agreed. Bob Goranson said he would rather it remained. Discussion followed. Overhang issues and illegal placement of banners were discussed and Bob Goranson said he wanted to make sure that balloons and banners were included in this ordinance. Allen Stanton pointed out their location in the ordinance and said this provides a greater level of enforcement.

Mike Lester asked if an object can be considered a sign if it doesn't have writing on it if it is readily identifiable with a particular company. Farhad Daroga clarified that a registered logo on any surface is a sign without letters. Discussion followed.

Bob Goranson referred to the size of a sign for multi-users not to exceed 500 square feet, and asked what would be considered the 500 feet and it was clarified that display area would not include filler and architectural features. Discussion followed regarding attention-getting devices, canopies and banners.

8. continued

Allen Stanton said billboards are ground signs, which are addressed in this ordinance, as freestanding signs. Discussion followed regarding size, spacing and distance of these freestanding signs from other signs, the legal requirements and the means of controlling them.

Farhad Daroga said the City should be content-neutral, the courts have ruled on this and once a sign is up no one can dictate what should be on it. He said the signs can be allowed by size, height and separation and leave the content neutral. He said there is a smaller billboard, called eight sheets, that is usually placed on railroad property.

Allen Stanton outlined the number, placement and location of signs allowed on turnpike and highway frontage, citing the ordinance. Discussion followed.

Renate Caldwell left at 7:41 p.m.

Ralph Sigler said the ordinance should address “on-premise” signs, stating that only on-premise advertising is allowed, in other words, businesses can only advertise their businesses on their own property and space cannot be leased to allow others to advertise on lots. Discussion followed and Allen Stanton said this would directly impact owners of property along Highway 51 that chose to use their signage to advertise subdivisions located elsewhere.

Mike Lester asked about enforcement of lighted signs and discussion followed.

Johnnie Parks said the on-premise sign requirement should be in the ordinance because that would mean a sign represents the business on the property rather than space being rented out. This would result in an aggregate of fewer signs in the city. Discussion followed and Mr. Sigler said if this provision is not on the books, it would allow signs such as “Walgreens one mile,” “Walgreens one-half mile,” “Walgreens one-quarter mile.” Further discussion followed and April Parnell said if the on-premise requirement is placed in the ordinance, there is a possibility that the city could be sued for restraint of trade. The Commission decided to exclude an on-premise requirement from the ordinance. Mike Lester said this hearing should be continued to the next meeting in order to have the ideas that have been refined placed in the ordinance and to get some legal standing on them.

Bob Goranson said he had a comment in regard to paragraphs D and E on page 7 and asked if the statement about vehicular pedestrian traffic is correct and it was verified by Staff that the statement should have read “vehicular and/or pedestrian traffic.”

Bob Goranson said he thought some of Mr. Whitaker’s comments regarding banners have been incorporated into the ordinance and the number of signs and the time period were discussed and Staff clarified that one sign per lot is allowed. Mr. Sigler said four permits a year (for temporary signs) are allowed that will span 30 days each, so they can be run independently during the 30 day period or concurrently and tie all the allowable days together for a total of 120 days for one banner. Brent Murphy said in Section 2.5 states that temporary banner signs shall not exceed one sign at any given time. Allen Stanton said Section 2.1A, the specific language discusses the permitting of banners. Bob Goranson said the reference should read in the singular, “banner, temporary or mobile business sign.” Discussion followed.

8. continued

Allen Stanton explained that this came to pass because the one to one was already there, not in the old ordinance, but in the one that came to the Planning Commission the first time, the one to one was there, the 25-foot was there, the 35-foot was there. How it can be put together in some kind of triangle that works, one to one slope, start measuring at the property line, that was the closest, because if you start at the 17-foot line, 25-foot high, you start measuring 25-feet, you actually get the 35-foot closer to the property line than you do under this formula. He talked about the drawings done and said they had looked at where the sign could be placed and make a 35-foot high sign work. The appropriate starting point was discussed and Ricky Jones said the Sign Committee arrived at 25-feet through a review process that included several different elements. Discussion followed regarding the process used.

Johnnie Parks said the ordinance does a poor job of talking about the setback so someone other than sign people or legal needs to look at the setback to determine whether to start from the property line, the right-of-way or other. He said he could not find the criteria for this and the criteria needs to be moved to the setback section. He said the setback issue is a central issue and he needs to be able to visualize how far the setback will be from existing property. He said he has attempted to visualize the distances involved, but other elements intrude.

Brent Murphy said he has recommended that "ultimate right-of-way" be used to be consistent with what is shown in the Comprehensive Plan. Johnnie Parks asked what is the ultimate right-of-way and Brent Murphy said it is 70-feet from the centerline within 500-feet of an arterial street intersection. Mike Lester asked if that definition could be stated so it is understandable to the layman. Brent Murphy said it could. He said on a major arterial, the ultimate right-of-way is 60-feet and if it is a minor arterial, it is 50-feet and that could be incorporated in the setback section.

Farhad Daroga said this is the same issue that came up in the previous committee, it is clearer to the lay person, if you begin at the section line or centerline, which is universal, and start a dimension from that point. The ambiguity of the term property line to the property owner was discussed and Bob Goranson said the definitions could be laid out in tabular form similar to the existing (existing ordinance?) and figure out what the 20-feet behind the ultimate right-of-way is and measure it from the centerline.

Brent Murphy said that might be confusing because of the differences in the setback in the various street types. Discussion followed.

April Parnell, said, in her opinion, referring to the ultimate right-of-way is an excellent way to define this term. She said lay-persons look for definitions for industry shorthand. She pointed out the location of that definition in the ordinance. Johnnie Parks said the definition should be placed in Section 1.1 that there is a 25-foot setback from the ultimate right-of-way. Allen Stanton talked about the inconsistency of the rights-of-way in Broken Arrow and the difficulty it causes in determining each right-of-way. Discussion followed.

Mike Lester asked how to control the disparity of skewed signs, placed at different setbacks. Discussion followed and Ralph Sigler said people will usually place signs as close to the property line as possible and this provides the continuity of lining up of the signs. The effect of signs on landscaping was discussed.

8. continued

Farhad Daroga said the 80-foot setback from centerline came out of the last committee in 1989 because the Subdivision Code called for all intersections for the first 1,000 feet, to have a 70-foot right-of-way. That has been amended to 500-feet. The setback then started 80-feet from the section line. That is how 80-feet originated, because landscaping is placed in the first ten feet. He said an alternative is to measure the starting point from the section line or centerline. Discussion followed and the Commission reached consensus in using the ultimate right-of-way.

Bob Goranson asked if the Commission agrees on the height and setback of signs and Johnnie Parks said they agree on the setback, but not on the height, but they don't need to agree at this point on the height until this issue is reviewed at the next meeting.

Bob Goranson said he wants to address strobing or flashing lights and Staff said the City does not allow these.

Mr. Sigler said Mrs. Whitaker had pointed out an instance of a sign with flashing lights and he, having looked at it, agreed with her that it was unsightly and the Committee included a prohibition on strobing or flashing lights. He said, on changing messages, the appearance of flashing cannot be avoided. Discussion followed regarding scrolling messages, the required time for a message to remain on a sign before it changes and the appearance of flashing LED gives.

Bob Goranson asked if the Commission is in agreement that the maximum size of signs will be 300 square feet for a single user and 500 square feet for multiple users.

Allen Stanton asked the Commission to provide Staff with guidelines on desired height and setback. Discussion followed regarding the size of signs and their effect or non-effect on business and Johnnie Parks said we need larger signs and signs closer to the street, and there must be a happy medium. Further discussion followed regarding itemizing the desire of the Commission on the issues that have been discussed.

Johnnie Parks asked about the addition of one foot of height for each foot further back a sign is moved (stair-stepping). Bob Goranson said he was not in favor of that. He suggested beginning with 20-foot setback. Johnnie Parks asked about stair-stepping back after 25-feet. Bob Goranson said he is not in favor of one foot for one foot back, that he would pick one number and step it up. Mike Lester said if that is done, the applicant has discretion. Discussion followed. Johnnie Parks said he would agree with the 20-foot setback, but he was in favor of the stair-stepping. Allen Stanton explained how the setback and stair-step ratio works. Ralph Sigler asked what the maximum setback would be. The Commission reached consensus on the 20-foot setback, stair-stepping (one for one) starting at 25-feet and stopping at 30-feet. Johnnie Parks said if you went back 35-feet, it would be 30 feet high and if you went 40-feet back, it would still be 30-feet high.

Johnnie Parks said the Commission should define limited access and said he doesn't have a problem with 50-feet high. After discussion, the Commission changed the limit to 35-feet.

Allen Stanton referred the Commission to page 1, paragraph B, which refers to candle power for lighted signs. Ralph Sigler outlined the parameters of the requirements listed in the draft ordinance. Discussion followed regarding the maximum candle power to be allowed on lighted signs.

Bob Goranson asked Staff to make the changes discussed for the Commission to review at their next meeting.



8. continued

**Motion** by Mike Lester to continue the public hearing on the proposed sign ordinance to the next meeting (November 6, 2003) of the Planning Commission. The motion was seconded by Bob Goranson.

Bob Goranson said to make sure the revised ordinance goes on the City's web site as soon as possible so people can see it. Mike Lester said if Staff could get the revised ordinance to the Commission before the Friday before the meeting, it would be helpful.

Yes: Jones, Parks, Lester, Goranson

No: None

**Motion approved**

9. The Commission opened a public hearing continued from October 9, 2003, to consider an amendment to Article V (chart), Article VI, Section 4 (R-2), Section 5 (R-3), of the Broken Arrow Zoning Ordinance, pertaining to Side Yard Requirements. The Commission discussed whether to continue this hearing to the next meeting to give the public an additional opportunity to speak on this matter, since it was so late. Allen Stanton said one of the members of the audience had made a comment to him that he just wanted to listen to see what the Commission wanted. Bob Goranson said the only changes in the R-3S district will be the 20-foot backyard and the five-foot and five-foot side yards. There were no persons present for this hearing besides Staff and the Planning Commission members.

**Motion** by Ricky Jones to recommend approval of the proposed amendment to Article V (chart), Article VI, Section 5 (R-3), of the Broken Arrow Zoning Ordinance, pertaining to Side Yard Requirements. The motion was seconded by Mike Lester.

It was clarified by Staff that this matter was advertised as pertaining to the R-2 and R-3 zoning districts, but the action taken at the last meeting pertained only to the formation of an R-3S zoning district and that is the only action being taken at this time.

Yes: Jones, Parks, Lester

No: Goranson

**Motion approved**

This matter will be heard by the City Council in their meeting of November 17, 2003 at 7:00 p.m.

10. The Commission opened a public hearing continued from October 9, 2003, to consider an amendment to Article VI, Section 6 (R-4), Section 7 (R-5), pertaining to side yards for single-family detached residences. Farhad Daroga presented the background, saying the R-4, R-5 and R-6 zoning districts have different requirements, and Staff recommends approval of changing of the ordinance allowing detached single-family residential use five-foot and five-foot side yards and 20-foot minimum rear yards in the R-4, R-5 and R-6 districts. He said each of these are multi-family categories but they also allow detached single-family use and this change will relate only to single-family use.

Johnnie Parks said that does open it up for all the existing R-4, R-5 and R-6 districts and Staff agreed. Bob Goranson asked if anyone present wishes to address the Commission regarding this matter. No one came forward.

Mike Lester said he does not like anything that affects what people have already bought into. Bob Goranson said more R-3s are coming in than any other districts and if they want five and five the Council can waive it. Discussion followed.

**Motion** by Mike Lester to deny this change. The motion was seconded by Johnnie Parks.

Bob Goranson said the Commission may be asked to form R-4S, R-5S and R-6S. Mike Lester said, even so, the obligation of the Commission is to protect the interests of the citizens of Broken Arrow and people who have bought into these, did so under certain stipulations and now the City is going to say someone can come in and change that and he didn't think that was right.

Allen Stanton said R-4 and R-5 are for multi-family applications and when those districts are discussed it is in the context of multi-family applications, except for the capability of placing single-family detached residences in those districts. He said that will not have an impact as it would in a subdivision zoned R-3.

The Commission discussed the impact of this change and Allen Stanton said if an applicant wishes to build a single-family dwelling in an R-4 district, there is a follow-up section within the R-4 zoning that states when a single-family dwelling is constructed in an R-4 district, this is the criteria under which it is to be built. He doesn't see where that would affect any existing property. Discussion followed in regarding to the setback requirements in the multi-family zoning districts and how this change would affect them.

The maker of the motion, with the consent of the second, withdrew his motion to deny this change.

**Motion** by Mike Lester to continue to November 6, 2003, this amendment to Article VI, Section 6 (R-4), Section 7 (R-5), pertaining to side yards for single-family detached residences as recommended by Staff. The motion was seconded by Johnnie Parks.

Yes: Jones, Parks, Lester, Goranson

No: None

**Motion approved.**

11. DISCUSSION ITEMS

11A. Consideration and approval of the 2004 Calendar for the Planning Commission.

**Motion** by Mike Lester to approve the 2004 Calendar for the Planning Commission as proposed. The motion was seconded by Ricky Jones.

Yes: Jones, Parks, Lester, Goranson

No: None

**Motion approved**

12. **REMARKS, INQUIRIES AND COMMENTS BY PLANNING COMMISSION AND STAFF**  
**NO ACTION**

None.

13. **Motion** by Ricky Jones at 9:55 p.m. to adjourn. The motion was seconded by Mike Lester.

Yes: Jones, Parks, Lester, Goranson

No: None

**Motion approved**